



TEXTILE CODE

WEEKLY NEWS SERVICE

Entered as second-class matter September 28, 1932, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 11, 1933.

WHOLE NO. 1224

WILLIAM GREEN, President

WASHINGTON, D. C. SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1934

FRANK MORRISON, Secretary

VOL. 14, NO. 39

Text of Inquiry Board's Report to Roosevelt on Ways to Settle the Textile Strike

Board Supports United Textile Workers' Demand for Ending the Abuses of the Stretch-Out System, Determining Hours and Wages on Accurate Economic Facts of Textile Industry, Recognition of the Union for Collective Bargaining, and Sweeping Reforms in the Administration of the Labor Provisions of the Textile Code by the Appointment of Textile Labor Relations Board to Take the Place of the National Cotton Textile Industrial Relations Board—NRA is Stripped of Authority to Administer Labor Provisions of Cotton Textile Code.

By A. F. J. L. News Service.

On September 17, 1934, President Roosevelt's Board of Inquiry for the Cotton Textile Industry, which was organized to investigate the nationwide strike of the textile workers, declared to take effect September 17 by the United Textile Workers of America, submitted its report to the President.

The report described the board's futile attempts to mediate the dispute between the board and the textile workers, and then gave an account of its own investigation of the demands made by the United Textile Workers of America. It recommended that the board be dissolved and that the United Textile Workers of America be recognized as the exclusive bargaining agent for the textile workers. It also recommended that the National Cotton Textile Industrial Relations Board be replaced by a new Textile Labor Relations Board, and that the National Recovery Administration be stripped of authority to administer the labor provisions of the Cotton Textile Code, conferring that authority upon the new Textile Labor Relations Board.

In commenting on the report, President Roosevelt said that it "presents findings and recommendations which cover the basic source of difficulties, and does this in a way which shows the whole fair and reasonable approach with which the board undertook its task. I think, a good example of the practical way in which industrial problems can be calmly discussed and solved under a republican form of government."

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, said that the report "is a masterpiece of constructive and sane analysis, and shows clearly that those employed in the textile industry had real grievances, and were suffering from wrongs which called for immediate redress."

The Executive Council of the United Textile Workers of America called off the strike on September 24 on the basis of the board's report and recommendations, declaring: "We have now gained every substantial thing that we can gain in the strike."

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF INQUIRY FOR THE COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY TO THE PRESIDENT

This Board of Inquiry was appointed by you on September 8, 1934. I have authorized it to investigate and report to you on the causes of the strike, and to make recommendations for its settlement. It has held numerous public hearings, and has received many suggestions from the workers and the employers. It has also conducted extensive research into the economic conditions of the cotton textile industry, and has gathered a mass of material which it has now summarized in this report.

The board has directed to report its findings, findings and recommendations, and to submit a report to the President not later than October 1, 1934. The report of the board is being submitted to you today, September 29, 1934. It is being submitted to you in the form of a report, and in the form of a summary of its findings and recommendations.

Considered Only Fundamental Issues

It has conferred in length with representatives of parties to the controversy; it has received many suggestions from the workers and the employers; it has gathered a mass of material which it has now summarized in this report. It has conferred with officials of the National Recovery Administration, the National Industrial Relations Board, the Bureau of Labor Statistics and other governmental agencies. It has also conferred with the employers and the workers, and has received many suggestions from them.

The report of the board is being submitted to you today, September 29, 1934. It is being submitted to you in the form of a report, and in the form of a summary of its findings and recommendations.

Official's report uses striking example of Roosevelt board's plan

Report of National Strike Committee of the United Textile Workers Calling Off Nationwide Strike, on Basis of Recommendations of President Roosevelt's Board of Inquiry, Reviews Grievances of the Textile Workers and Explains How They Will Be Adjusted by the New Textile Labor Relations Board and Other Recommendations of the President's Inquiry Body.

By A. F. J. L. News Service.

The report of the National Strike Committee of the United Textile Workers of America to the Executive Council of that organization urging that the nation-wide strike of the textile workers be ended on the basis of the recommendations of the report of the President's Board of Inquiry for the Cotton Textile Industry contains an informative review of the grievances of the textile workers and how those grievances were referred adjustment by the employers and the National Recovery Administration, which refusal resulted in the general strike.

The report also declares that the demands of the United Textile Workers are largely met by the recommendations of the President's Board of Inquiry, which will result in sweeping reforms in the administration of the labor provisions of the Code for the Cotton Textile Industry, practical recognition of the United Textile Workers as the collective bargaining agency for the employers of the industry, methods of determining wages and hours by indisputable facts collected by government agencies, and the end of abuses of the stretch-out system.

The report of the General Strike Committee should be read by all textile workers and working men and women in connection with the report of President Roosevelt's Board of Inquiry for the Cotton Textile Industry. The text of the National Strike Committee's report follows:

It is in the background of the strike situation and then takes up in detail each of the basic issues involved. It concludes with a summary of the board's recommendations.

BACKGROUND OF THE STRIKE

The cotton textile industry employs normally from 400,000 to 450,000 workers. It is composed of approximately 1,200 firms. The largest firm in the industry produces not more than one or two per cent of the total product. About one-third of the industry is located in the North; two-thirds in the South.

During the war the textile expansion, enormous in scale, was carried out by the industry. Mills which had formerly been operated on a one-shift basis began to run two shifts or more. After the war, demand fell and many of the mills were closed or operated on a one-shift basis. During the boom years before 1929 the cotton textile industry as a whole was not considered prosperous.

LABOR CONDITIONS IN THE COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Labor conditions in the cotton textile industry have for a number of years been below those of the average American industry. According to the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average wage paid in the cotton textile industry has since 1923 been below that paid in any other major industry. Some of the reasons for this have been long and conditions of work for many years have been frequently below those of the average for all manufacturing industries.

CODE PROVISIONS ON HOURS, WAGES

Upon the passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act in 1933, the cotton textile industry was the first to make provision for the recovery of its workers. The code provided for a basic four-hour week, with machine operations limited to 40 hours per week. The code also provided for a minimum wage (except for certain classes of workers) of 15 cents per hour. The code also provided for a maximum of 11 1/2 hours in the South and 11 1/2 hours in the North for forty hours a week. Child labor in the industry was prohibited.

The code provided for a basic four-hour week, with machine operations limited to 40 hours per week. The code also provided for a minimum wage (except for certain classes of workers) of 15 cents per hour. The code also provided for a maximum of 11 1/2 hours in the South and 11 1/2 hours in the North for forty hours a week. Child labor in the industry was prohibited.

STRETCH-OUT SYSTEM IS GRAVE PROBLEM

The problem of the "stretch-out" or "speed-up" has been one of the most serious complaints of the workers. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker.

STRETCH-OUT SYSTEM IS GRAVE PROBLEM

The problem of the "stretch-out" or "speed-up" has been one of the most serious complaints of the workers. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker.

STRETCH-OUT SYSTEM IS GRAVE PROBLEM

The problem of the "stretch-out" or "speed-up" has been one of the most serious complaints of the workers. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker.

STRETCH-OUT SYSTEM IS GRAVE PROBLEM

The problem of the "stretch-out" or "speed-up" has been one of the most serious complaints of the workers. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker.

STRETCH-OUT SYSTEM IS GRAVE PROBLEM

The problem of the "stretch-out" or "speed-up" has been one of the most serious complaints of the workers. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker.

STRETCH-OUT SYSTEM IS GRAVE PROBLEM

The problem of the "stretch-out" or "speed-up" has been one of the most serious complaints of the workers. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker. It is a system of determining wages on the basis of the amount of work done by the worker.

of 25 per cent. This curtailment was provided for by the code for the months of June, July and August, 1934. No public hearing was held on the curtailment order, but it will be developed later. It was the curtailment of 25 per cent without increase in wages, which caused the workers and helped to precipitate the present controversy.

UNION ORGANIZES TEXTILE WORKERS

Shortly after the adoption of the code there was little organization of labor in the cotton textile industry. The United Textile Workers of America claimed a membership of from 15,000 to 20,000 in the textile industry, and there was no other organized national union in the industry. The United Textile Workers of America claimed a membership of from 15,000 to 20,000 in the textile industry, and there was no other organized national union in the industry.

LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

On July 10, Section XVII of the Cotton Textile Code (the code creating the Cotton Textile National Industrial Relations Board and utilizing the mill committee procedure) was amended by the National Recovery Administration. This amendment changed the composition of the board. The board was increased to five members, adding another employer representative and four additional representatives to be chosen from the cotton textile industry.

UNREST GROWS AMONG EMPLOYEES

First was a growing feeling that the industry under the code was not doing its best for the workers. The code provided for a minimum wage of 15 cents per hour, but the industry was not doing its best for the workers. The code provided for a minimum wage of 15 cents per hour, but the industry was not doing its best for the workers.

STRIKE SETTLEMENT

On August 19 two new members, Mr. J. H. P. and Mr. J. H. P., were appointed to the Cotton Textile National Industrial Relations Board. The board was increased to five members, adding another employer representative and four additional representatives to be chosen from the cotton textile industry.

STRIKE SETTLEMENT

On August 19 two new members, Mr. J. H. P. and Mr. J. H. P., were appointed to the Cotton Textile National Industrial Relations Board. The board was increased to five members, adding another employer representative and four additional representatives to be chosen from the cotton textile industry.

STRIKE SETTLEMENT

On August 19 two new members, Mr. J. H. P. and Mr. J. H. P., were appointed to the Cotton Textile National Industrial Relations Board. The board was increased to five members, adding another employer representative and four additional representatives to be chosen from the cotton textile industry.

STRIKE SETTLEMENT

On August 19 two new members, Mr. J. H. P. and Mr. J. H. P., were appointed to the Cotton Textile National Industrial Relations Board. The board was increased to five members, adding another employer representative and four additional representatives to be chosen from the cotton textile industry.

STRIKE SETTLEMENT

On August 19 two new members, Mr. J. H. P. and Mr. J. H. P., were appointed to the Cotton Textile National Industrial Relations Board. The board was increased to five members, adding another employer representative and four additional representatives to be chosen from the cotton textile industry.

STRIKE SETTLEMENT

On August 19 two new members, Mr. J. H. P. and Mr. J. H. P., were appointed to the Cotton Textile National Industrial Relations Board. The board was increased to five members, adding another employer representative and four additional representatives to be chosen from the cotton textile industry.

STRIKE SETTLEMENT

On August 19 two new members, Mr. J. H. P. and Mr. J. H. P., were appointed to the Cotton Textile National Industrial Relations Board. The board was increased to five members, adding another employer representative and four additional representatives to be chosen from the cotton textile industry.

STRIKE SETTLEMENT

On August 19 two new members, Mr. J. H. P. and Mr. J. H. P., were appointed to the Cotton Textile National Industrial Relations Board. The board was increased to five members, adding another employer representative and four additional representatives to be chosen from the cotton textile industry.

was called by the United Textile Workers in Alabama. This strike had not been called off, and has been merged into the general strike in the industry. Labor Board Tried To Settle Strike

LABOR BOARD TRIED TO SETTLE STRIKE

The present textile strike was formally voted at the convention of the United Textile Workers in New York about the middle of August. Later in August the Cotton Textile National Industrial Relations Board offered its services as mediator. This offer was rejected by the union, which stated it had no further confidence in the ability of that board to meet the situation. The National Labor Relations Board immediately undertook to bring about an agreement before the strike was called.

EFFORTS TO END STRIKE

The board invited representatives of the union and of the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute. The board then invited the union and the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute.

EFFORTS TO END STRIKE

The board invited representatives of the union and of the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute. The board then invited the union and the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute.

EFFORTS TO END STRIKE

The board invited representatives of the union and of the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute. The board then invited the union and the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute.

EFFORTS TO END STRIKE

The board invited representatives of the union and of the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute. The board then invited the union and the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute.

EFFORTS TO END STRIKE

The board invited representatives of the union and of the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute. The board then invited the union and the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute.

EFFORTS TO END STRIKE

The board invited representatives of the union and of the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute. The board then invited the union and the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute.

EFFORTS TO END STRIKE

The board invited representatives of the union and of the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute. The board then invited the union and the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute.

EFFORTS TO END STRIKE

The board invited representatives of the union and of the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute. The board then invited the union and the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute.

EFFORTS TO END STRIKE

The board invited representatives of the union and of the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute. The board then invited the union and the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute.

EFFORTS TO END STRIKE

The board invited representatives of the union and of the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute. The board then invited the union and the Cotton Textile Institute to a joint conference in Washington. The union, which declined to attend, stated that the Cotton Textile Institute declined to attend, contending that the union was not a party to the dispute.